



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

would pray with us without being asked. And, certainly, I think that if these holy spirits could know of the honour paid to them here, and how often they supplant their Blessed Master in the minds of men, they must be deeply pained; and certainly would not be more disposed to intercede on behalf of those thus dishonouring their Lord.

M. If they could know! And do you doubt their being able to know what passes here?

F. To be sure I doubt a thing for which I have not a shadow of proof. What reason is there, for instance, to think that the Blessed Virgin can hear the innumerable prayers offered to her at the same time in thousands of places, all over the earth's surface. Is not this contrary to all reason? Is it not making her as omnipresent as God Himself?

M. I asked Father O'Driscoll once how this could be, and he said that this privilege had been given her by God at the time of her entrance into heaven.

F. And did this content you? or did you ask him how he found this out?

M. No; I suppose that is the doctrine of the Church.

F. Well, it is very singular, if she did get this privilege, that not a word should have been said about it in the Bible, and that no one in the Church should have suspected it for hundreds of years.

M. I cannot argue out of the Bible or the Fathers with one who has read so much more than I; but do you really think that the saints in heaven know nothing of what passes on earth? Why, how could they be happy if they were left in ignorance of the fate of those whom they loved on earth, whom they might have left in the midst of trials and dangers, and concerning whom they must long to know whether or not they have surmounted these?

F. I might as well ask you how they could be happy if they heard that their friends had not surmounted these dangers; or if, as we know must be often the case, they beheld those dear to them treading on the downward path that leads to destruction, and preparing for eternal separation from themselves and from God.

M. Oh, Frank, this argument in your mouth is hard to answer. I hardly dare to say that it would be for our mother's happiness to know what is passing on earth, when I think of the change that has taken place in you, except that I believe there is still a great happiness in store for her and for me, in your return to the faith.

F. My dearest child, I did not mean to make you cry; but I do feel that it was a merciful dispensation that she was spared the pain of seeing me take a step which at that time would have distressed her beyond measure; but which, I am assured, would appear to her in a very different light now, if she could know of it. But as to the question you have raised as to the happiness of the blessed: I know not that we have a right to suppose that anything can be wanting to the happiness of those who are in the presence of the Lord; and, surely, their resignation to His will must be so perfect, and their trust in Him so complete, that they will be content to leave all earthly matters in His hands.

M. I should like, however, to hear what you say to that other question, of which I have often thought, and especially lately: how can one be happy in Heaven if one dear to them were lost for eternity?

F. It is, indeed, a painful question; yet we know that earthly love will at length give way, if lavished on an object who has repeatedly proved himself unworthy of it. Kindness over and over again repaid with ingratitude, unfeeling selfishness, baseness of disposition, will weary out love at last. Well; no one can be lost who has not wearied out a love far surpassing in tenderness the purest earthly love. I suppose we may believe that long before the love of the Redeemer can abandon any one, or give him over to a reprobate mind, the love of those who on earth best loved that lost one will have been changed into indignation at the despite done unto a Saviour still dearer to them. Yes, it seems that the only way in which we can conceive of the happiness of the blessed is believing that their union with their Saviour's will and their concern for His glory are stronger feelings with them than any earthly love. And, if we weigh this, it makes us see, I think, how little we should gain by praying to the saints, instead of to Christ, and how little it is to be expected that they would be willing to receive us, supposing that His love was exhausted, and that He were unwilling Himself to receive our petitions.

M. It may be so; but I do not feel that I can talk any more controversy now.

F. I feel that too; but if you will promise me to read your Douay Testament I shall feel that this would be better than any controversy in bringing you to agree with me.

M. Surely, I remember many texts being quoted in defence of the intercession of the saints.

F. I hardly know what these texts are; but I don't think so much of the effect produced by one particular text or two, as of the whole tenor of the book. I really cannot remember a single passage directing us to ask the prayers of the Virgin and the saints; and when I think how impossible it would be to use such prayers without placing over confidence in them, I can see good reason why it should be so. The whole book sends us directly to Christ, as our only hope, our only confidence.

Ever since I have made that book my daily food, and have made myself familiar with the character of our Blessed Lord there described, I feel it impossible to think of any one else as more loving or more compassionate than He, or more ready to hear and answer my prayers.

M. You know I am not ignorant of the Testament. But, I confess, ever since your perversion (for I must call it so) I have been afraid to open the book. And I know what Father O'Driscoll would say if I were to tell him I was reading it.

F. Well, I can't think that any man has a right to forbid you God's Word; but, at all events, I don't see why he should know. For though you think it right to confess your sins to him, it surely cannot be a sin to read God's Holy Word, in the translation approved by your Church, and bearing your archbishop's name.

M. Don't ask me to promise you now, Frank; but I am thankful that I have seen you, for I have accustomed myself to think of Protestants scarcely as worshipping the same God as ourselves. But I see now it is only your head that has gone astray, and that there is as much religion and love of God in your heart as ever.

F. If I were to tell you all, you would find that I never believed so little as during that last year when I was nominally a Catholic. But there is not time for this now. Give my love to dear Ellen and Catherine. Tell them you have seen me, and try to make them think as charitably and affectionately of me as you do.

Correspondence.

"DO THIS IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME."

—LUKE, XXII, 19.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—The text which I have placed at the head of my letter is one the right understanding of which must be owned to be very important. The Church of Rome teaches that by these few words our Lord ordained as priests his apostles who were then present, gave them power to transubstantiate bread and wine into his body, and directed them to offer up that body as a sacrifice for the living and the dead. May I trespass on your space with a brief inquiry whether the words are capable of bearing this meaning.

First, then, do the words "do this" mean, offer Me up as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead?

It is plain that the words "do this" mean "do what I have just done and am doing now;" and that if our Lord were not at that time offering Himself up as a propitiatory sacrifice, neither was He charging the apostles to do the same. Now, it must be remembered that the words in question were spoken on Thursday evening, the day before the crucifixion. If our Lord had on that evening already offered a sacrifice of infinite value as a propitiation for the sins of the living and the dead, then it would have been unnecessary that the sacrifice on the cross should have been offered on the next day. A few hours after these words "do this" were spoken, our Lord, in the agony at Gethsemane, wrestled in prayer with his Father. "If it be possible, let this cup pass from Me." Now we know that that cup of sorrow did not pass from Him; and since no prayer of Jesus could have been unheard, we may conclude with certainty that it was not possible that the salvation of the world could be otherwise accomplished. If we imagine such a case possible as that the Saviour, instead of praying, "Not my will, but Thine be done," had refused to drink the cup of suffering which his Father had placed in his hand, and had not become obedient unto death, even unto the death of the cross, who can venture to deny that the work of propitiation for sin would have been left unaccomplished, and that, notwithstanding that He had instituted the supper on the evening before? If, then, it must be owned that on Thursday evening the infinitely precious sacrifice of Christ's body for the sins of the world had not been yet offered, He was not then offering that sacrifice, and by the words "do this" He could not have directed his apostles to do what He was not doing Himself.

Secondly, by these words "do this" did our Lord mean, "make my body?" If He did, it follows that our Lord on that occasion made the bread and wine into his own literal body, that with his own hands He took up his own body, brake it, and gave it to his disciples. Monstrous as this conclusion is, the Church of Rome has not shrunk from it. I copy the following words, which have already appeared in your paper, vol. iv., p. 125, quoted from Mr. Faber's work on the Sacrament, and describing our Lord's own communion on that Thursday evening: "The incarnate Lord received Himself incarnate, was held in his own hands, lay upon his own tongue, descended into his own heart, by the most real reality on earth, his own real presence in the Blessed Eucharist."—Faber, p. 477. Surely, if anything so startling as this had taken place the sacred writers would have explicitly mentioned something about it; yet Roman Catholics have no option but either to adopt the monstrous doctrine stated by Mr. Faber or else to admit that our Lord did not turn the bread and wine into his own natural flesh and blood, and, therefore, to be forced to own that the words "do this" gave no such power to his apostles.

Further he says, "Do this in remembrance of me."

Now, remembrance is not compatible with actual bodily presence. A friend going away may, on taking leave of you, ask you to remember him, but he would not ask you to remember him at the moment that he was promising to come to you. Who can believe that the words, "do this," mean bring me bodily into your presence in remembrance of me?

I think it is certain that any man who reads the narrative, without having any theory to support, but just satisfied to take the words in their plain meaning, can put no interpretation but one on our Lord's words "Do this in remembrance of me"—that is to say, Do what you have seen Me do. Take bread, break it, and bless it: then distribute it among yourselves and eat it: and so likewise with the wine, and this all is to be done in remembrance of Me.

I conclude, then, that the Eucharist is a commemoration of the sacrifice of Christ. But as Jesus was Himself alive when He instituted the ordinance, and as He did not then offer up Himself as a sacrifice on the cross, or hold in his own hands his own crucified body; so we have no ground for believing that we are commanded to offer Him up afresh, or that we are to expect to feed carnally upon his natural flesh and blood. His body has been offered up once for all, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice. We may plead the remembrance of that sacrifice before God; may tell it out to the world: may believe that while we eat the symbols with our mouths we feed upon the Saviour in our spirits: but we have no warrant to believe, and we could find no greater comfort in believing, that Christ was to be really sacrificed every day, and his very flesh and blood to be eaten and drunk by our bodily mouths.

Yours, &c.,

R. H. B.

ON THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—Might I beg your insertion of a few remarks, intended as supplementary to those in my letter on the Sacrifice of the Mass, published in your last number. I trust it is not necessary to apologize for trespassing again on your valuable space on a subject so important, and deserving the strictest investigation. In the letter referred to, I proved, I hope, satisfactorily, that the sacrificial act in the Mass, being unbloody, could not be propitiatory, because, "without shedding of blood is no remission." Roman Catholic writers feel this difficulty; and to extricate themselves from it, have recourse to certain explanations and arguments, which also I examined at some length. They admit the Mass has no propitiatory virtue in itself, and that it derives all it has only from its connection with the Sacrifice on the Cross. They maintain, then, of course, that there is such a connection, and endeavour to prove it. They assert that the Mass is the application to the souls of the faithful of the fruits of the Sacrifice on the Cross. They assert, and also endeavour to prove, that the Sacrifice in the Mass and that on the Cross are one and the same. As to the former—that is the doctrine of *application*—I have nothing at present to add to what I said in my former letter. As to the latter position, that the two sacrifices are one and the same, I brought forward various arguments to show they could not be so—the one was bloody; the other is unbloody; in the one, there was suffering and death; in the other, there is neither. I showed that the offering priests in both were essentially different—that the times also were different; the one sacrificial act was performed and finished 1800 years ago; the others, as they are many, nay innumerable, may be performed to-day or to-morrow, or a year or years hence, as they have been years past; and what I wish to add at present is, that the same may be said with regard to *place* as well as *time*: the one sacrifice was offered up near *Jerusalem*; the others are in thousands of different *places*, and under thousands of different and opposite circumstances; and we ask how can they be the same, when there are so many essential points of dissimilarity and contrariety as all those I have enumerated, and more besides. There is, nevertheless, an answer given (a very convenient one, I may add, for getting rid of difficulties and troublesome arguments), and that is, that the doctrine is a *mystery*. Now, I would not wish to utter a syllable that would be calculated in the slightest degree to lessen the reverence every one should feel for *revealed* mysteries. God forbid. But to attempt to show by reasons and arguments that the sacrifices are the same; and when these are met by counter reasons and arguments, and proved insufficient, it seems scarcely fair then to reply that the subject is a mystery. To escape the force of certain opposing passages of Scripture, they have recourse to many explanations and ingenuities of defensive reasonings; but when hard pressed in turn by stronger reasonings, they take refuge in mystery. Waiving, however, any further consideration of this, let us test the soundness of the answer. In doing so, I maintain, in the first place, what I think is nearly self-evident, that the truth of a mystery, even above that of other propositions or doctrines, should be established by sufficient evidence. A great structure should not be erected on a narrow and shallow foundation. Thus, when the pretensions and claims in any case are great, they ought to be sustained by sufficient credentials; in like manner, where the mystery is great—so great as to stagger reason at every step—and when the practical consequences also built on this mystery are of such magnitude, it is not unreasonable to require it should be supported by corresponding proofs. Are these to be had

in the case of the Sacrifice of the Mass? We unhesitatingly answer, they are not. There is an utter deficiency, an absolute absence of all proof in the New Testament. There is no trace of a sacrifice in the words of institution. "Do this in remembrance of me" cannot by any rules of interpretation be made to mean, offer me as a propitiatory sacrifice, in an unbloody manner, for the sins of the living and the dead. Neither is there any trace of this doctrine in the descriptions of or allusions to the Eucharist in any part of the New Testament. St. Paul says:—"For as often as you shall eat this bread, and drink the chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord till He come." 1 Cor. xi., 26 (Douay). Here is a representation and memorial of the Lord's death, and consequently of his sacrifice, but no offering of a propitiatory sacrifice itself. And again the same Apostle in the same Epistle, ch. x. 16 (Douay), says: "The chalice of benediction which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? And the bread, which we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord?" The faithful communicant feeds on the sacrifice already offered up. He spiritually eats the flesh of Christ, and drinks his blood (or literally does so, if you will); but he offers no propitiatory sacrifice in it to God for his own sins, or those of others: neither does the officiating minister. And as there is no trace of a sacrifice in the new law, except that on the cross; so is there none of a sacrificing priest under that new law, except the Lord Jesus. The term, "*ιερευς*," which means a sacrificing priest, and is applied to those under the law, and to our Saviour, is never applied to the ministers of the New Testament. For this doctrine, then, which claims to be one of the new law, there is no evidence in the New Testament, and in default, its advocates turn to the old; and as the result, produce two passages; one a supposed prophecy of the Mass, which I considered in my former letter: the other a supposed type, which I did not notice in that, because, though quoted occasionally, it is not in general much relied on, and because, also, though the argument from it is little to the point, yet the answer would have added considerably to the length of my letter. But should your kindness allow me again a space in your valuable publication, I shall endeavour so far to supply this apparent omission, by noticing at present the text in question. Your readers will, no doubt, anticipate me in my quotation, and will know at once I refer to Genesis xiv., 18. In the Authorized Version it is as follows:—"And Melchisedek, king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine, and he was priest of the Most High God, and he blessed him." In the Douay translation:—"But Melchisedek, the king of Salem, bringing forth bread and wine, for he was the priest of the Most High God, blessed him, and said, &c." There are several differences here between the two translations; one of them a very material one, where the word translated "*and*" in the Authorized is in the corresponding place rendered "*for*" in the Douay Version. This difference essentially alters the meaning; for, according to the Douay, the reason why Melchisedek brought forth bread and wine was because he was the priest of the Most High God; and, therefore, what he brought forth was intended not for the refreshment of Abram and his followers, but as a religious oblation offered to God in virtue of his priestly office.

The word *and* in the Authorized Version implies only the fact that he was the priest of the Most High God. Which is the correct rendering? In the Authorized, the same word is translated in the same way in all the places it occurs in verses 18 and 19; in the Douay it is rendered differently—in the 19th verse, "*and*," as it is in the Authorized—in the 18th verse, "*but*" and "*for*." "*And*," is the correct translation of the original word, and the change to "*for*" seems to denote "a foregone conclusion," and made to suit a purpose. My first argument against the Roman Catholic application and interpretation of the passage is drawn from this most serious mistranslation. In the next place, granting that the bread and wine were an oblation—was it propitiatory or otherwise? If it be said propitiatory, then Scripture is contradicted, which authoritatively and solemnly enunciates as an everlasting truth, "without shedding of blood is no remission" or propitiation. If not a propitiatory sacrifice, how could the bread and wine be a type of a propitiatory sacrifice? The type in the point of resemblance cannot be essentially different from the antitype. Thus, the animals sacrificed under the law were types of Jesus, and the essential feature of resemblance was the shedding of the blood: without this feature they could not have been types of his sacrifice. By a parity of reasoning, the Mass cannot be a propitiatory sacrifice, because the type is not one; and thus the passage, on their own interpretation, disproves what it was brought forward to prove. Now, the plain and sound exposition of the text is, that Melchisedek brought forth bread and wine to refresh Abram and his followers, on their return from the slaughter of the kings; for, be it remembered (what seems to be forgotten by the advocates of the other interpretation) that Melchisedek was a king as well as a priest, and that, as king, he was a party interested in Abram's victory, and also able to provide suitable entertainment for so large a party, which an humble priest might not have had the means to do. Like the king of Sodom, he came forth to congratulate Abram on his success, and express his own obligations to him for it. But he was a priest as well as a king, and as such, he blessed Abram. Herein was the execution of his priestly office: as the priests under the law

of Moses were enjoined solemnly to bless the people, for which purpose also a form of words was prescribed. (See Numbers vi. 23-27—Douay.) In the whole of this interpretation we are borne out by St. Paul, in his comment on the circumstance in the Epistle to the Hebrews, c. vii. vv. 1, 6, 7—(Douay). The Apostle dwells there on the fact of Melchisedek's blessing Abram, and from that infers the superiority of the former over the latter; but he makes no mention whatever of the bread and wine. If they had had any spiritual or religious meaning, and one so important as that alleged, would the Apostle have been totally silent on it? Whereas, on the supposition of the other interpretation, it would have been quite natural for the inspired writer, treating exclusively on spiritual subjects, to omit noticing that part of the narrative that referred to a merely temporal one. Such are the two passages—this and the one in Malachias noticed in my former letter—taken out of the whole Bible; and every candid reader must admit that they are utterly insufficient to give any proof of the truth of the Mass. But a mystery, and one so important as this, should, even above other doctrines, be established on clear and sufficient evidence to demonstrate its truth. Therefore, the conclusion from the whole is, that the so-called mystery of the Mass, possessing no scriptural evidence deserving the name, is unscriptural, and, consequently, untrue.

Anything further in this line of argument might seem unnecessary after what has been said; but it may tend to the fuller establishment of our proof to examine the internal claims; the Mass has to be considered a true mystery; its advocates claim to have it judged, not so much by the canons of common reason, as by the rules that regulate a mystery. We shall give a definition of a mystery that we hope will be found unobjectionable. A mystery, then, is an article of faith, above our reason, but not contradictory to it, where our reason can judge. It should not have plain contradictions—that is, contradictions judged according to the definition. We maintain that there are such in the Mass. Is it not a contradiction to say that the sacrificial act in the Mass is unbloody, and at the same time propitiatory, when they admit without shedding of blood there is no remission. Again, the sacrificial act is unbloody, and yet, at the same time, bloody; for if it is not bloody, there is no propitiation, and if it be bloody, it is not the Mass, which is defined to be an unbloody sacrifice.

There is also a manifest contradiction involved in the assertion that while each consecrated Host, and each part, though it were broken into a thousand fragments, be Christ whole and entire, yet that these fragments, innumerable as they are, are not many, but one; with other contradictions I need not mention. There is no revealed mystery in the doctrine, but a grafting of error on truth; and every attempted explanation is only a vain struggle to reconcile this error with Holy Scripture and reason, each producing greater inconsistencies than the other, just as an addition by another hand to a building of perfect symmetry betrays at once its incongruity to any eye of right taste and judgment, notwithstanding all the efforts of some prejudiced or interested parties to prove that it formed a portion of the original structure.

And, in conclusion, I would beg earnestly to add, that thus to corrupt the plain simplicity of the solemn ordinance of the Eucharist, and to create mysteries where God has made none, is, besides requiring men to believe error instead of the truth, calculated also to multiply difficulties and stumbling-blocks in the way of earnest inquirers, and expose Christianity to the insults of infidels and bring it into contempt.

Yours, &c.,

F. H.

ON THE SUPREMACY OF ST. PETER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—On reading over your last essay relative to the claims put forth by the Roman Catholics for the supremacy of Peter over all the other Apostles, and the several places where Peter is placed only on the same level with the rest of the Apostles by our Lord Himself, as well as in the estimation of all the rest, I cannot but think that, had the supremacy of Peter been recognized by the Apostles, we should not find Paul using the following statement in his Epistle to the Galatians (ch. ii., ver. 6):—"For of those who seemed to be something (evidently meaning James, Cephas, and John), (as in the 9th ver.) what they were sometime, it is nothing to me; God accepteth not the person of men; for to me they that seemed something added nothing. (7th verse) But, contrariwise, when they had seen that to me was committed the Gospel of the uncircumcision, as to Peter that of the circumcision; (9th verse) And when they had known the grace that was given to me, James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that we should go unto the Gentiles and they unto the Circumcision." (Rheims version.)

What I beg your attention to is the order or sequence in which Paul places these three names, viz., James first, Cephas (i.e., Peter) second, and John third; evidently showing, that St. Paul, 18 years after his conversion, and having constant intercourse with the Apostles, should thus place them, and did not give St. Peter the pre-eminence.

James, Cephas, and John were those three whom our Lord particularly distinguished during His ministry, and, we may suppose, were pre-eminently prepared to

take a prominent part in the future affairs of His Church; but St. Paul evidently disallows St. Peter's pre-eminence here, by giving him the second place only in the ministry. This also contradicts those who say that as Peter is *always* mentioned first in a catalogue of the Apostles, he must be foremost in rank.

But we have here even a stronger evidence that St. Peter had not this pre-eminence; for St. Paul, after thus enumerating these three Apostles, in the sequence already quoted, immediately remarks, "that they three seemed to be pillars." Seemed to be! Surely, if Peter, or even all these three, had any superior authority given them, the Apostle Paul would here have expressed it, and submitted to their authority, which he did not; but acted an independent part through the whole course of his ministry. And, why, if Peter was to be head of the Gentile Church, were not the arrangements exchanged? Or why was not Peter associated with Paul in his conversion of the Gentiles? Surely, such an arrangement would have taken place if the Holy Ghost had intended that Peter should be pope.

On speaking to a Roman Catholic gentleman on this subject, and asking him why Peter was placed only second, he said that it was of no consequence how he was there placed. I said, "Suppose we were to speak of three persons of rank, and to say, 'the Duke of Wellington, George the Fourth, and Earl Grey, said so-and-so,' would not every one cry out shame? But," said I, "how can you account for the Apostle Paul's ignorance in not knowing that even the above three Apostles were only *seemingly* pillars?" This, he acknowledged, he could not account for, and should consult some priest of sufficient intelligence! And I doubt if any other fair answer can be given than that it upsets Peter's title to be the Head of the Church on earth, whether by the title of God's Vicegerent, His Holiness, or the Pope.

Protestants are too apt to concede that St. Peter was for any time in Rome, or there at all, in opposition to the several Epistles written by St. Paul from Rome, and his epistles to the Romans—in none of which St. Peter is saluted, or any salutations from him. We are told it might have been dangerous to mention St. Peter's name in these salutations! Surely, in letters which were not to be opened till they reached their distant destination, this could not be the reason. And it was as dangerous for St. Paul to mention his own name, as he does in every one of them, as also those residing and inmates in Cæsar's and Aristobulus' (King Herod's son) houses. Besides, St. Peter directs his epistle from Babylon, at the very time they say he was at Rome. "Oh!" they say, "Babylon means Rome;" but they won't allow that title to be applied to her in the Revelations, in her future persecution of the saints. "But," say others, "how can Babylon mean the city of Babylon, which was then in ruins?" But, on referring to Josephus, he mentions Babylon (evidently a new city called after the old), situate on the Tigris, and in which there were, as well as in several contiguous cities and ports, a great number of Jews resident. He mentions a high priest having been put out of office by King Herod escaping to Babylon or the neighbouring cities, and made chief priest over that region.

No doubt, in consequence of Rome being the metropolis of the world, attempts were early made to induce a belief that Peter was appointed Pope; but we have no evidence at all, except records evidently fabulous and documents interpolated to say what the writers themselves were ignorant of.—Yours, &c.,

A READER OF THE BIBLE.

FARM OPERATIONS FOR DECEMBER.

Wheat.—As the storing of the roots is proceeded with, let the land be prepared as directed last month, and sown with wheat, if suited to its cultivation, using some one of the steepens named in our last calendar for the prevention of smut.

Winter Vetches, when not sown in sufficient breadth last month, may be sown early this month, mixed with rye or winter oats.

Winter Barley, Bere, or Rye may still be sown either as soling or for grain.

Early Potatoes, if not planted in sufficient breadth, may still be proceeded with in dry, open weather. At this time of the year they are best cultivated in lazy bed, from 4 to 6 feet wide, and require a liberal dressing of stable dung, and about 6 inches of cover from the furrows, to keep out frost. Early Oxfords, Cumberland bangors, and kemps are the kinds most suited for planting now, and come in early.

Parsnips and Carrots, to come in early, may now be sown: the land should be deeply tilled and well manured with rich compost or decomposed dung, and be well incorporated with the soil, to grow those roots to perfection.

Meadows and Grass Lands should be highly manured during this and the succeeding months with marl, loamy gravel, bones, farm-yard manure, or rich composts, taking care not to trespass on them with carts in very wet weather. When the manures are spread, and dry enough, they should be well bush-harrowed and rolled.

Ploughing.—All stubble lands should be well and deeply ploughed during the month. Lea lands intended for green crops should also be ploughed up, to allow time for the sods to rot before cross-ploughing in the spring.